

GP 50

December 28, 2002

Ms Karen Hagerty, Planning, Programs, and Project Mgmt Division
Department of the Army
Rock Island District Corps of Engineers
Clock Tower Building - P O Box 2004
Rock Island, Illinois 61204-2004

RE: Proposed lease of Camp Daybreak, Coralville Lake, North Liberty, Ia
Official Public Comment in response to Environmental Assessment

TOPIC: BIAS

Dear Karen:

Thank you for forwarding John Castle's "selection criteria" forms comparing the **MYCA** and **IO-DIS-E-CA** applications originally considered by the **Corps** of Engineers back in **1999**. We had received copies of the selection criteria forms completed by Staebell, Clevenstine, and Johanson with our Freedom of Information **Act** request back in May of **1999**, but the Castle form was missing from the group. You mailed that form to me 12/13/02.

I have looked at all four sets of forms. I am not a statistician, but under no scenario can I see where the **MYCA** proposal would have been rated higher than the **IO-DIS-E-CA** proposal based on these forms.

There were **18** questions on the criteria sheet. If you tally the responses, **IO-DIS-E-CA** comes out ahead in 11 of the 18 questions. **MYCA** comes out ahead on 5 of the questions. One question is a tie. One question is either a tie or **MYCA** comes out ahead; Castle circled two answers.

Since each criteria sheet has a total marked on it, I assume that you rated the sheets based on total points. When I add the total points, **IO-DIS-E-CA** gets 157 points, **MYCA** 153 or 154. John Castle's form appears to be totalled incorrectly. His form says 35 for the **MYCA** proposal. I get 38 or 39, which is reflected in the 153/154 number.


For the record, I would like to have an explanation (including copies of documents) showing how **MYCA** was selected over **IO-DIS-E-CA**.

32-5 — My reason for compiling this information is my feeling that the commitment by the **Corps** of Engineers to make this proposal work was made in 1999 or before. Actions and comments made by some COE employees and representatives of **MYCA** since 1999 indicate this is a "done deal".

31-8
6-1- Errors and omissions in the EA (noted in letters to you in response to the EA) slant the findings in favor of a finding of "no significant impact" and toward a decision in favor of Alternative #1. These inaccuracies include misplacement of existing wells on maps, misstatement of the distance from the osprey nesting site to the main lodge, and disregard for the protected shoreline designation that exists in the 1977 Master Plan. In addition, all impacts noted in the EA are based on counts that are clearly not the maximums possible based on the design. Finally, the assumption that the daybreak area is designated "Recreation-Intensive Use" is in question; I certainly cannot find that in the 1977 Master Plan.

Unfortunately, the Environmental Assessment was done to justify a proposal already on the table. It was not an objective study. We all could have avoided so much grief if the Corps of Engineers had worked with local governments to come up with some alternatives that fit with the existing environment and complied with local zoning regulations PRIOR to making a commitment.

Sincerely,



Lynne M. Kinney
3530 Cumberland Ridge Rd NE
North Liberty, Ia 52317

CC: Grassley, Harkin, Leach